L'ESTRANGE
NO
PAPIST.

Odi profanum vulgus & arceo.

LONDON,
Printed by *F. Leach*, for *Charles Brome*,
at the *Gun* at the West-End of
St. *Pauls*. MDCLXXXV.

LESTRANGE

ON

PAPIST.

Odi profanum vulgus & arceo.

LONDON,

Printed by F. Leach, for Charles Brome,

at the Gun at the West-End of

St. Pauls. MDCLXXXV.

L'ESTRANGE
NO
PAPIST
NOR
JESUITE, &c.

Prag. Well and what is become of your *L'Eſtrange* now I trow, your great *Goliah L'Eſtrange*, and your ſo much Idolized *Diana*?

Philo. Very wel; and is this all you can ſay? no leſs than a Gyant and a Goddeſs both in a breath? could not you have ſaid your *Gogmagog* and your *Pentheſilea* Queen of the *Amazons*? it would have done every whit as well, and have made a more noble ſound, but that ſuch hard names might have chanced to have ſtuck in your Throat and choaked you. But pray tell me Mr. *Pragmaticus*, what makes you ſo inquiſitive

after *L'Eſtrange*? I ſhall ſhrewdly ſuſpect you are the man that ſent out the Hue and Cry after him, unleſs you give me very good reaſons to believe the contrary.

Prag. No really not I: But I hear there is one gone out after him, but cannot overtake him, and I cannot imagine why it ſhould not, unleſs you have ſent him away Poſt upon *Pegaſus*, or ſwept him into a corner with your Broom amongſt your refuſe ſtuffe. Tis great pity a man of parts as he is ſhould ly ſculking about at this rate, and not dare to ſhow his head. I fancy he looks very pleaſantly upon it, and dare ſwear a Cut of him in the preſent poſture he is in would ſell rarely well.

Philo. Come leave off your ſilly ſcoffs, and witleſs reproaches, and let us know what is the quarrel you have againſt *L'Eſtrange*.

Prag. Quarrel quoth he? Why he is a *Papiſt*, and is not that Quarrel enough in all Conſcience? and you deſerve to be called in queſtion, if you take his part, or maintain that he is not.

Philo, So, very good ſtill. Then I perceive it is become now as criminal to ſpeak well of *L'Eſtrange*, as to drink the Dukes Health, and all becauſe one is ſuppoſed to be a *Papiſt*, and the other is ſo. But pray tell me one thing, ſuppoſing, though not granting *L'Eſtrange* to be a *Papiſt*, may not a man for all that ſpeak in his behalf, *quatenus* an honeſt man?

Prag.

Prag. That is a good one: An honeſt *Papiſt*? who ere heard of that before? no let me tell you, it is an abſurdity, nay an utter impoſſibility. An honeſt man perhaps may be a *Papiſt*, but a *Papiſt* can never be an honeſt man: and there is the ſhort and the long of the buſineſs pithily delivered in few words.

Philo. All pith I confeſs, and no ſap. But under favour is this learned and nice diſtinction your own, or did you borrow it?

Prag. No matter for that. I ſay ſtill the *Papiſt L'Eſtrange* is a *Papiſt*; and whoſoever ſpeaks a good word of him is a Popeling, an Abettor of the Diabolical party, and an ill Commonwealths man. And if you ſay the Dukes Health may be drank; I affirm that ſuch an aſſertion deſtroys the Liberty of the Subject, as much as denying the Right of Petitioning, and therefore as a filthy, abominable and ſuperſtitious thing ought to be laid aſide.

Philo. Acutely argued. I perceive by this you are a man of parts and perhaps can give me the reaſon (which I confeſs I never heard yet) why you think *L'Eſtrange* is a *Papiſt*.

Prag. What need of any Reaſon, when all the Town and Country ſay ſo? ſure their words may be taken without any farther Reaſon.

Philo. And therefore you believe him to be a *Papiſt*, becauſe he is generally reported one.

Prag.

Prag. Yes marry do I: and every good Chriſtian ought to do the like.

Philo. I always thought that every mans own perſuaſion and practice had made him of this or that Religion, and not anothers ſaying ſo: But it ſeems you think otherwiſe, and *L'Eſtrange* muſt needs be a *Papiſt*, becauſe the people vote him one: then I ſay, according to your way of arguing, if he be a *Papiſt*, they ought to be puniſhed for being acceſſary to his being ſuch, for it is evident he was none before they talked him into it, What have you to ſay to this?

Prag. Ay but it is ſworn againſt him (they ſay) that he is one, and ſure that will ſerve your turn.

Philo. Indeed this has prevented me from asking you one queſtion, which was, how the Town and Country, which you ſay generally believe him to be a *Papiſt*, ſhould come to know ſo much, unleſs he had declared it to them himſelf, and given a Certificate under his own hand to put the matter out of diſpute, for his publick Profeſſion has all along ſpoken the quite contrary. But now I underſtand that the ground which you or they have to believe him a *Papiſt*, is only becauſe ſuch and ſuch have ſworn againſt him that he is one. Doth their ſwearing then make him a *Papiſt*, whether in his own Opinion he be ſo really or no?

Prag. I ſay if they ſwear he is a *Papiſt*, I am bound to believe it: and if they ſhould do as much for you I would endeavor to have you proſecuted.

Philo. I grant you that then in the Eye of the Law he is one, for that proceeds and judges according to the Teſtimony given upon Oath: but this is not the buſineſs in Diſpute. I would fain know whether any impartial perſon (theſe Oaths that you ſpeak of notwithſtanding) may not, all circumſtances well conſidered, ſtill conclude that *L'Eſtrange* is all this while an honeſt man, and a true Son of the Church of *England?*

Prag. Not at all: for I tell you, as I ſaid before, if it be given upon Oath that he is a *Papiſt*, I dare pawn my life that he is one, and I look upon the teſtimony to come from ſuch well meaning perſons, and true Lovers of the Church, that I dare ſafely ſwear the ſame my ſelf.

Philo. Very pretty: but what if two or three well meaning malicious fellows ſhould ſwear that you was in the Plot, would you therefore be ſuch a fool to belive it, and ſwear the ſame, and ſo e'ne be fairly truſſed up for your pains.

Prag. Why no, the caſe is altered then: And I would ſay, that they were a company of Raſcals, that ſhould ſwear I was in the Plot, when I know no more of it than the child that is unborn: beſides, what need I care? I am clear enough, ſo long

long as my Conſcience plainly tells me that I have no hand in it:

Philo. So, then the Kings Evidence it ſeems may be a company of Raſcals, if they ſhould chance to depoſe any thing againſt you, when in the mean time whatſoever is ſaid or ſworn againſt another man paſſeth with you for an Oracle. This is very fine is it not? but may not another mans Conſcience give theſe bold ſwearers the ly as well as yours can do? and will you not allow poor *L'Eſtrange* the liberty to make uſe of the ſame Plea which you would your ſelf? This is very hard meaſure.

Prag. How can that be, when his own Conſcience tells him he is a *Papiſt* and uſes to go to Maſs? if he would but have dealt ingenuouſly, he might have gone to the Council, and informed againſt himſelf, without putting any body elſe to the trouble of doing it.

Philo. And have told them he had a great mind to be hanged, and therefore came to ſwear that he was up to the Ears in the Plot, though he never ſo much as dipped his little Finger in it. Pray friend have a care what you ſay, for if Dr. *Oates* and the reſt ſhould come to know that you ſhould offer to adviſe any man, *Papiſt* or not *Papiſt* to do any ſuch thing; take my word for it, they would certainly fall foul on you for going about to take away their livelyhood. But you ſaid that his Con-

Conſcience tells him ſo and ſo: have his Conſcience and you had any late Conference together (I dare not ſay Conſult, becauſe it is grown a dangerous word) about theſe matters, that you are ſo peremptory in aſſerting, that it will flatly declare him a *Papiſt*?

Prag. Nay, if you go on cavilling at your rate, there is no talking with you: pray tell me one thing, how can his Conſcience chuſe but tell him that he is a *Papiſt*, when it is ſo evident, that all the world knows it?

Philo. So evident, that all honeſt underſtanding men believe the quite contrary. For to ſay nothing of his conſtant and approved Loyalty all along to the King, when he had opportunity enough to be otherwiſe, of his good carriage and reputed honeſty, and the notorious ill manners of his Accuſers, though this might be a large Theme for Diſcourſe: what rational ſober man could ever think him ſo ill adviſed, or (to uſe the term which ſome ſlanderous tongues would fix upon him) ſo mad, as by publick Writings, and a Practice correſponding to his private Sentiments, to derive a great and everlaſting odium upon himſelf from two different Parties, ſeemingly as far diſtant and oppoſite as the two Poles, though both concentring in one fatal miſchief,

the ruin of this poor Church and State; I ſay who can ſuppoſe that this man, out of his affectionate Love to his King and Country, and Filial Duty to his Mother the Church of *England*, ſhould expoſe himſelf ſo undauntedly to all the Malice and Spleen that could be vomited out upon him from the mouths of thoſe foul-mouthed Beaſts, and yet be all this while a ſecret favourer of one of theſe Parties, whilſt he pretends to be an open abhorrer of Both?

Prag. A very fine ſpeech, neatly harangued, as if you had a pention for doing it: but I underſtand never a word on't: what Parties, what Beaſts are theſe you talk of, or do you but dream?

Philo. To be more plain with you, I mean the *Papiſts* on one hand, and the *Fanatics* on the other.

Prag. Oh, now I underſtand you: and this is wonderful ſtrange you ſay, that he ſhould be a profeſt enemy to the *Papiſts*, and yet be one himſelf underhand: I pity your ignorance; as if the Pope could not grant a Diſpenſation for all this: why it is ordinarily done in ſuch caſes, and I thought you had not been ſo ſhallow as not to apprehend it.

Philo. You will make a mear changling of his Holineſs by and by, if you could but prove that he would grant a Diſpenſation to have his own throat

throat cut. When the Pope ſends Emiſſaries into *England* to promote the *Catholic Cauſe*, perhaps he may allow them to make uſe of ſome Pious Frauds the better to carry on their deſigns, and when ſome of them have the honour to die Martyrs at *Tyburn* with a lye in their mouths, then goes the common cry, that they have the Popes Diſpenſations and Abſolutions to lick all whole again: and granting this to be ſo, nay and more than that, that *L'Eſtrange* had a Diſpenſation too, what great harm would it do, ſo long as it is only to preſerve his Allegiance and approve himſelf true and faithful to his Church, King and Country?

Prag. Ay but theſe confounded Diſpenſations are of a ſtrange nature, for I have heard that by the ſtrength of one of them a man may come to our Church, wear a Peruque and a Sword by his ſide, flatter and fawn upon the King, and cry God bleſs your Majeſty, I wiſh you a long and proſperous Reign, and then Stab or Poiſon him at the firſt opportunity, and yet for all at laſt go to Heaven in a ſtring. And I think on it a little better, might not *L'Eſtrange* be a Jeſuite and be like enough to do ſome ſuch like Prank at the long Run?

Philo. What and no *Papiſt*? for I hope I have convinced you that he is not.

Prag. Yes for ought I know he may.

Philo. And a married man too?

Prag. That does not ſignifie a ruſh: for I tell you that plaguy Diſpenſation, (would it was hanged) has done more miſchief to this Kingdom than all the *French* Kings Garlick Eaters would do if they ſhould come over: For they ſay Prieſts and Jeſuites cannot marry, but I'le warrant they may upon a good account, and therefore I ſay ſtill, for ought I know *L'Eſtrange* may be a Jeſuite, though he is a married man, and no *Papiſt* neither as you ſay: And that is nothing but a blind, a mere blind.

Philo. You might as well ſay a man may be Bred and Born in *London*, and yet be no *Engliſh*-man. I tell thee plainly, thou art one of thoſe ſmatter-braind fellows, that catch at all they can hear, and underſtand things by halves, and get the names of *Papiſt* and *Jeſuite* into their mouths, and make a great rumbling noiſe with them enough to ſour all the Milk in the Kingdom, and do not know one ſyllable what their meaning is.

Prag.

Prag. Not know what their meaning is? I thank you heartily for that: you might as well ſay I did not know my own name. No I'le warrant, when they would have blown up the Parliament-Houſe on the fifth of *November*, when they ſtirred up Rebels in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, and raiſed a Civil-War in *England*, and cauſed the King to be put to death, and when they Fired the City, and now in this preſent Plot endeavoured to kill our moſt Gracious Soveraign, we did not know what their meaning was; what other meaning could they have but to kick good old Proteſtaniſm out of doors, and introduce Popery, and ſet up a company of Shavelings in the Church? Uds my life, he that does not at this time of the day ſee plainly what their meaning is; I affirm him to be a ſtark blind Aſs, and I ſtand to it.

Philo. Theſe are bloody things you lay to their charge, and perhaps ſome of them may be true; and for avoiding contention we will grant them all to be ſo for once, whether they be or no; but don't you think the *Papiſts* were the Contrivers, the Plotters, or the Authors (call them which you will) of the laſt great Plague among us too?

Prag.

Prag. Nothing more likely in my judgment; for what with their Maſs mumbling, their Exorciſms, Conjurations, Incenſe and Holy-water (God bleſs us) they have raiſed ſuch a pother and ſent ſuch a foule ſtink among us enough to cauſe an infection to ſpread not only over the City, but the whole Nation too.

Philo. Ingeniouſly made out, if you had added their Squibs and Crackers too. But this is nothing to the buſineſs I was mentioning; for when I ſpoke of *Papiſts* and *Jeſuites*, I ſaid you did know what the words meant, and if you do, pray do me the favour to tell me.

Prag. That I will. Why look you now, if you could get a Painter to draw a company of ill-looked fellows with Bags of Gun-power and Piſtols in one hand, and Daggers and long Knives in the other, that would be the very Picture of *Papiſts* and *Jeſuites*.

Philo. But then I ſuppoſe it muſt be writ under them, theſe are *Papiſts*, and theſe are *Jeſuites*, as they uſe to write a company of Verſes underneath to explain the Frontiſpiece.

Prag.

Prag. No there would be no need of that; for I tell you their very looks would betray them and ſpeak what they are.

Philo. This is the notion then I perceive you have of them: but you forget to deſcribe their Religion: Do you think they are Chriſtians or no?

Prag. No by my Faith, hang me if I do: for I look upon the Grand *Signior* or the Great *Mogul* to be a thouſand degrees better Chriſtians than they.

Philo. But what if I ſhould prove that they are Chriſtians?

Prag. Do that, and I'le ſay as you ſay.

Philo. All proof would be needleſs to a man of underſtanding: But firſt, I'le take it for granted that ours is but a Reformed Church; and wherever there is a Reformation, there muſt be ſuppoſed ſome Errors and Abuſes which were to be Reformed. Now theſe Errors and Abuſes were and are ſtill in the Church of *Rome*, which no more hinder it from being a Chriſtian Church (though groſly corrupted) than a company of Boils and Sores ſhould make you ceaſe to be a man (though an infirm one) The caſe then is thus; ſhould ſome of theſe Boils and Botches, which I will ſup-

poſe

poſe to be in your Body, be cured and done away, that part which had them may be ſaid to be whole again: ſo our Church of *England* being but part of the Catholic Church was once infected with thoſe abominable impurities and foul Diſeaſes the Church of *Rome* now labours under, from which being cleanſed, and purged, it became a pure Church, ſound and healthful, whilſt the Church of *Rome* remains tainted at this day. And ſo you your ſelf being (as you would make me believe you are) a true Proteſtant, are neither better nor worſe than (be not ſtarted at the word) a Reformed *Papiſt* by derivation from your Anceſtours. This I hope will convince you that the *Papiſts* are neither Dogs nor Cats, Wolves, Dragons, nor fiery Serpents, but men like you and I, and Chriſtians too, but not ſo good as they ought to be, nor as it is wiſhed they were.

Prag. This ſomthing gravels me if it be true: but what is all this to the proving *L'Eſtrange* no *Papiſt*? ſo long as people write and talk againſt him and call him *Papiſt*, I cannot find in my heart but believe them.

Philo.

Philo. And ſo ſome impudent malicious Raſcals call him Hang-Dog, and Towzer, *&c.* and do you therefore think in your Conſcience, that he is either a Bull-Dog, Spaniel, Mongrel or the like; I have not much time to talk with you about this matter, but will only tell you in few words, that *L'Eſtrange* is yet a true and ſincere Proteſtant notwithſtanding all the trifling Reaſons that you or any one elſe could ever yet bring againſt him. VVe are not to make ill concluſions from the preſent misfortunes of the manner, frame, unreaſonable and uncharitable conjectures and ſurmiſes, from his abſconding for a time, which may be for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf, and not ſo fit to be known to his Enemies: but I hope it will not be long ere he will return with a VVhip and a Bell to laſh theſe barking Curs, that durſt hardly ſnarl or grin whilſt he ſhewed his Face. 'Tis ſure there was never a more impudent and brazen-faced Age, than this we live in, when the beſt men ſhall be aſperſed with touleſt Calumnies, and the beſt Proteſtants, the Biſhops themſelves not paſſing ſcot-free, be branded with odious names of *Papiſts* for being zealous for their King and Countries good. It is to be wiſhed that we could

could once see a Reformation in our manners instead of seeking one continually in our Religion. And then we should let Protestants be Protestants still, and *L'Estrange* might live quietly without having the imputation of Popery belched out upon him through every poisonous and malicious throat. And so, farewel till we meet next time.

FINIS.

12860